

Rubric for 2007-2008 Title II, Part B Mathematics and Science Partnership Competitive Grant

Incentive points: Although not a federally mandated requirement for the grant, Arizona will award incentive points to proposals submitted by applicants who have not been previously funded by the MSP Program or from specific geographic areas in need of quality professional development in the area of science with a literacy emphasis. Up to 10 points can be added at the discretion of the review team based on the quality of the proposal.

1. Partnership Needs Assessment:

The needs assessment should indicate a clear statement of needs derived from multiple sources and multiple years if available.

Criteria	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Below Standard
1a. Baseline data	8 points There is clear evidence of baseline data from 3 or more teacher and/or student sources (i.e., norm-referenced assessments, AIMS results, district benchmark assessments, college transcripts) to support science/literacy education needs of the school population. If student data is available, it must be one of the sources.	6 points There is clear evidence of baseline data from 1-2 teacher and/or student sources (i.e., norm-referenced assessments, AIMS results, district benchmark assessments, college transcripts) to support science/literacy education needs of the school population. If student data is available, it must be one of the sources.	0 points Limited baseline data is given. Needs identified are not adequately supported by evidence.
1b. Identification of professional development needs	6 points In addition to the criteria for “Meets Standard” the needs assessment also includes a correlation between teachers’ content knowledge in science and student achievement.	4 points Provides information on the number of teachers lacking sufficient content knowledge in science.	0 points Vague or limited information is given about the number of teachers lacking sufficient content knowledge in science.
1c. Prioritization of professional development needs	4 points There is clear evidence included that partners have collectively determined which professional development needs are of the highest priority and will be addressed by the project.	3 points Some evidence is provided to show that the targeted professional development needs were selected with input from project partners.	0 points Limited or no evidence is given to indicate why the partnership selected the targeted professional development needs.

2. Partnership Project Goals and Objectives:

The project goals and objectives should be closely linked to the professional development needs of the teachers.

Criteria	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Below Standard
2a. Description of the project's goals and objectives	8 points Goals are clear and objectives are specific, measurable, attainable, results-oriented, time bound.	6 points Goals and objectives are well defined and measurable.	0 points Objectives are poorly designed and/or not measurable.
2b. Project is designed to achieve goals and objectives	8 points Goals and objectives are specifically linked to the individual professional development needs of the teachers.	6 points Goals and objectives are linked to the professional development needs of the teachers.	0 points Goals and objectives are poorly correlated with the needs assessment.

3. Research/Evidence Base and Efficacy of Plan to Increase Student Achievement:

The plan for professional development should be guided by research and the Arizona Academic and Professional Teaching Standards and the National Staff Development Council Standards. The carefully designed activities should link to the goals and objectives of the plan with emphasis on content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge.

Criteria	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Below Standard
3a. Theory of action plan or logic model is linked to goals and objectives of project	4 points Describes a detailed theory of action plan or logic model that clearly links to the goals and objectives of the project.	3 points Describes a theory of action plan or logic model that links to the goals and objectives of the project.	0 points Little or no connection is made between the theory of action plan or logic model to the goals and objectives of the project.
3b. Connecting prior professional development efforts to proposed project	4 points Provides detailed description of prior efforts to improve teacher content knowledge and student achievement in science and literacy, lessons learned from these prior efforts, and how this project will build on those efforts.	3 points Describes prior efforts to improve teacher content knowledge and student achievement and relates how this project will build on those efforts.	0 points Does not adequately address prior efforts to improve teacher content knowledge and student achievement and/or how this project will build on those efforts.
3c. Activities are linked to goals and objectives of proposal	8 points Provides specific and clear activities that link the goals and objectives stated in the project and the data provided by the needs assessment.	6 points Evidence is provided that activities will lead to achievement of the goals and objectives.	0 points Little or no correlation is made between activities and achievement of the project's goals or objectives.
3d. Supporting research linking professional development strategies and increased student achievement in science	10 points Clearly outlines how the professional development strategies are valid and reliable, based on cited evidence-based research and how the project will enable teachers to improve instruction and increase student academic achievement in science.	7 points Includes clearly documented evidence-based research that the professional development strategies will improve instruction and increase student achievement in science.	0 points Proposal includes references but provides little evidence of research linking professional development strategies to increased student achievement in science.

Criteria	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Below Standard
3e. Description and timeline of professional development activities	6 points Includes a clear and detailed description and timeline of all the professional development activities including the number, types, duration, intensity and responsible partner.	4 points Includes a general description and timeline of all the professional development activities including the number, types, duration, intensity and responsible partner.	0 points Includes an incomplete description and/or timeline.
3f. Planned activities are aligned with Arizona Academic Standards	8 points Includes a clear and detailed description of how the proposed professional development will incorporate the targeted Arizona Science and Language Arts Standards at the concept level.	6 points Describes professional development that is aligned to Arizona Science and Language Arts Standards at the concept level.	0 points Provides a limited description of how the professional development is aligned to Arizona Science and Language Arts Standards.
3g. Planned activities are aligned with Arizona Professional Teaching Standards and the National Staff Development Council Standards	4 points Describes a detailed plan that clearly illustrates how the proposed professional development is aligned with Arizona Professional Teaching Standards and the National Staff Development Council Standards, and provides for work-embedded application of new learning, continuous reflection, and ongoing support.	3 points Describes how the proposed professional development is aligned with Arizona Professional Teaching Standards and the National Staff Development Council Standards, and provides for work-embedded application of new learning, continuous reflection, and ongoing support.	0 points Does not provide sufficient evidence describing how the proposed professional development is aligned with Arizona Professional Teaching Standards and the National Staff Development Council Standards, or does not provide for work-embedded application of new learning, continuous reflection, or ongoing support.
3h. Planned activities contain rigor and challenging content and develop pedagogical content knowledge	10 points Includes evidence that the professional development is rigorous and challenging in academic content and explicitly addresses knowledge of content and students and knowledge of content and teaching.	7 points Includes evidence that the professional development is rigorous and challenging in academic content and also develops pedagogical content knowledge.	0 points Provides limited evidence that the professional development is rigorous or challenging in academic content and/or focuses mainly on pedagogy.

Criteria	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Below Standard
3i. Design elements for planned activities	4 points Proposed plan is aligned to a professional development design that fully develops these 4 elements (see Definitions Section): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learn the Content • Reinforce the Content Learning • Consolidate the Learning • Implement the Content Provides within sample plan, evidence that all four elements are addressed.	3 points Proposed plan is aligned to a professional development design that includes these 4 elements (see Definitions Section): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learn the Content • Reinforce the Content Learning • Consolidate the Learning • Implement the Content Provides within sample plan, evidence that all four elements are addressed.	0 points Proposed plan is aligned to a professional development design that is missing one or more of these 4 elements (see Definitions Section): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learn the Content • Reinforce the Content Learning • Consolidate the Learning • Implement the Content Or, sample plan does not provide evidence that all four elements are addressed.

4. Partnership Evaluation and Accountability Plan:*

Identify evaluation methods that the project will use and explain why those methods are appropriate to the identified needs the proposal addresses. A proposal must make a compelling case for the activities of the project and describe how the activities will help the MSP program build a rigorous, cumulative, reproducible, and usable body of findings.

Criteria	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Below Standard
4a. Design of evaluation plan is based on quasi-experimental or experimental design	8 points Describes a detailed evaluation plan based on experimental design, with defined treatment and comparison groups with adequate sample sizes in each group, in which intervention and comparison groups are constructed by randomly assigning some teachers to participate in the project activities and others to not participate.	6 points Describes a detailed evaluation plan based on a quasi-experimental design in which intervention and carefully matched comparison groups are constructed, with adequate sample sizes in each group.	0 points Describes an evaluation plan that is not based on experimental or quasi-experimental design.
4b. Measurable evidence for impact of project on student achievement and teacher effectiveness goals	8 points Appropriate multiple measures (e.g., NRT, CRT, RTOP, and DTAMS) are used to show the impact of the professional development on student achievement and teacher effectiveness. Description of both summative and formative assessment procedures and an analysis of results are included.	6 points Appropriate state or district measures (e.g., NRT, CRT, RTOP, DTAMS) are used to show the impact of the professional development on student achievement and teacher effectiveness. Description of both summative and formative assessment procedures and an analysis of results are included.	0 points Summative or formative assessment procedures are not described and/or an analysis of results is inadequate.
4c. Contribution to research	4 points Evaluation plan clearly articulates how the activities will help the MSP Program build a rigorous, cumulative, reproducible, and usable body of findings. Evidence provided indicates appropriate qualifications of the organization or individuals responsible for executing the plan.	3 points Evaluation plan clearly articulates how the activities will help the MSP Program build a rigorous, cumulative, reproducible, and usable body of findings.	0 points Evaluation plan inadequately articulates how the activities will help the MSP Program build a rigorous, cumulative, reproducible, or usable body of findings.
*If one or more indicators in this section are scored “Below Standard,” the grant proposal may be rejected.			

5. Commitment and Capacity of Partnership:

The project description must clearly demonstrate the submitting partnership has the capability of managing the project, organizing the work and meeting deadlines.

Criteria	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Below Standard
5a. Partnership's role in planning and development of proposal and project development, delivery, and evaluation	6 points Evidence is provided that clearly describes each partner's role in the planning and development of the proposal and each partner's role in the development, delivery, and evaluation of the proposed project.	4 points Evidence is provided that outlines each partner's role in the planning and development of the proposal and each partner's role in the development, delivery, and evaluation of the proposed project.	0 points Little or no evidence is provided to indicate the role of one or more partners.
5b. Duties and responsibilities related to the goals and objectives of the project	8 points The proposal includes a detailed description of the duties and responsibilities and how they are aligned to the goals and objectives of the proposal.	6 points The proposal includes an outline of the duties and responsibilities and how they are aligned to the goals and objectives of the proposal.	0 points Inadequate information on the duties and responsibilities is provided.
5c. Capacity of partnership	6 points Evidence of the number and quality of staff to carry out the proposed activities, a description of the institutional resources, vitas for key partners' staff and Teacher Assurance Forms are provided.	4 points Evidence of the number and quality of staff to carry out the proposed activities and a description of the institutional resources are not clearly detailed. Vitas for key partners' staff and Teacher Assurance Forms are provided.	0 points Explanation of capacity is inadequate and may be missing one or more of the criteria.
5d. Partnership governance	4 points The partnership's governing structure specific to decision-making, communication, and fiscal responsibilities is well defined and linked to the goals, objectives, and project activities. The proposal includes a description of how the private schools were informed.	3 points The partnership's governing structure specific to decision-making, communication, and fiscal responsibilities is provided but not specific. The proposal includes a description of how the private schools were informed.	0 points Inadequate information is provided related to partnership governance or how the private schools were informed.

5e. Sustainability	<p>4 points</p> <p>There is a clear and specific plan for project continuation. The plan addresses the obstacles to future funding, how assessment data will be used, how the project will be promoted within the school and school districts, and how leadership capacity at the principal and teacher levels will be fostered.</p>	<p>3 points</p> <p>Description of how the project will be sustained and continue when state funding is no longer available is outlined in the plan. The plan does address all of the following within the outline: how assessment data will be used, how the project will be promoted within the school and school districts and how leadership capacity at the principal and teacher levels will be fostered.</p>	<p>0 points</p> <p>There is an inadequate plan for how the partnership will continue when the state funding is no longer available.</p>
--------------------	---	---	--

6. Partnership Budget and Cost Effectiveness:*

The budget justification should clearly be tied to the scope and requirements of the project. The budget narrative should describe the basis for determining the amounts shown on the project budget page. All proposals should include provisions for evaluation of the activities.

Criteria	Meets Standard	Below Standard
6a. Budget details (In Narrative)	4 points The proposal provides a general summary of budget outlining specific costs of each category over the duration (12 months) of the project and includes a budget summary for each partner; the budget support the scope and requirements of the project.	0 points The proposal provides insufficient budget information specific costs of each category over the duration (12 months) of the project; the proposal provides insufficient information for each partner; or the budgets do not support the scope and requirements for the duration of the project.
6b. Cost effectiveness (In Appendix, Narrative)	6 points The amount included in each budget category is detailed and commensurate with the services or goods proposed, and the overall cost of the project is appropriate for the professional development provided and the number of teachers served.	0 points The amount included in each budget category is not commensurate with the services or goods proposed, or the overall cost of the project is not appropriate for the professional development provided and the number of teachers served.
6c. Provisions for evaluation and required meetings (In Appendix)	4 points The budget includes provisions for an evaluation, funds for key staff to participate in 2 state technical assistance meetings and 1 regional MSP meeting.	0 points The budget does not include adequate provisions for an evaluation, funds for key staff to participate in 2 state technical assistance meetings or 1 regional MSP meeting.
*Up to 5 incentive points will be awarded if one or more partners provide additional funding for the project beyond that requested in the MSP proposal		